TO:

Members of the Large House Study Review Committee

FROM:

Lee Newman, Planning and Community Development Director

DATE:

April 23, 2015

RE:

Field Assessments of Identified Demolition/Replacement Properties

During our recent meeting, it was generally agreed that members of the Large House Review Study Committee would take a look at some of the properties that involved demolition and replacement activity since January 2014. Given the significant number of these properties (76 properties in our analysis), the Committee's Working Group thought it would be useful to focus site visits on a sample of properties within several categories, as noted below. In this way we might more efficiently share our collective impressions at **our next meeting scheduled for May 1**st.

The properties that have been identified are listed on Page 2. To further assist you in these visits, please see attached questionnaire on Page 3. This brief survey should be used as a guide to help you review each property. It would be very helpful to have you record your thoughts, ideally using this format for each property. At our meeting of May 1, we will discuss the properties, and if you wish to submit your notes to us prior to or following the meeting, we can keep them and compile them. It's a lot, we realize, so just do the best you can.

#### **Site Visit Locations**

\*House size listed below only constitutes first and second floor living space

## Non-conforming lots that do NOT meet the proposed FAR standard:

- 29 Hawthorne Avenue (finished Basement), Lot size 6,970 sf, House size 3,404 sf, 48.8% FAR
- 10 Birchwood Road (finished Basement), Lot size 9,258 sf, House Size 3,848 sf, 41.6% FAR
- 10 Melrose Avenue (finished Attic), Lot size 7,193 sf, House size 3,002 sf, 41.7% FAR

#### Nonconforming lot that does meet the proposed FAR standard:

- 98 Grosvenor (finished Attic), Lot size 9,825, House size 3,726, 37.9% FAR
- 169 Laurel Drive (finished Basement), Lot size 9,900 sf, House size 3,244 sf, 32.7% FAR
- 122 Grosvenor Road (finished Attic), Lot size 9,825 sf, House size 3,726 sf, 37.9% FAR

#### Conforming lot that does meet the proposed FAR standard:

- 100 Damon Street (finished Basement), Lot size 10,000 sf, House size 3,748 sf, 37.5% FAR
- 105 Damon Road (finished Attic), Lot size 11,326 sf, House size 3,748 sf, 33.1% FAR
- 43 Norfolk Street (finished Attic), Lot size 10,007 sf, House size 3,586 sf, 35.8% FAR

#### Conforming lots that do NOT meet the proposed FAR standard:

- 40 Hazel Lane (finished Basement & Attic), Lot size 10,019 sf, House Size 3,902 sf, 38.9% FAR
- 33 Longacre Road (finished Basement & Attic), Lot size 10,890 sf, House size 4,262 sf, 39.1% FAR
- 24 Gary Road (finished Attic), Lot size 10,000 sf, House size 4,865 sf, 48.6% FAR
- 23 Dogwood Lane (neither finished), Lot size 10,350 sf, House size 4,590 sf, 39.7% FAR

### Large Lot with Large House:

- 50 Robinwood Avenue (finished Attic), Lot size 20,000 sf, House size 3,388 sf, 16.9% FAR
- 99 Ellicott Street (data unknown), Lot size 13,068 sf, House size 3,690 sf, 28.2%b FAR
- 89 Fair Oaks Park (finished Attic), Lot size 15,682 sf, House size 4,983 sf, 31.8% FAR

# LARGE HOUSE STUDY REVIEW COMMITTEE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT FORMAT

This brief survey should be used as a guide to help you review the suggested properties. It would be very helpful to have you record your thoughts, ideally using this format for each property. At our meeting of May 1, we will discuss the properties, and if you wish to submit your notes to us prior to or following the meeting, we can keep them and compile them. It's a lot, we realize, so do the best you can.

Name:	
Addro	ess:
1.	What is your gut feeling about the property in five words or less. This is your overall impression of the home, including the context it sits in.
2.	If the house complies with the proposed FAR standard, do you agree that is a good outcome? If the house does not comply with the proposed FAR standard, do you feel the circumstance would have benefited by this regulation?
3.	How does this house relate to its neighbors? How does the front setback compare? How does the side setback spacing relate to other spacing typical for the immediate area? Are the setbacks adequate?
4.	How do you feel about the location/prominence of the garage as well as any space above
	the garage?  If there is a front porch, does the introduction of this element assist in breaking up of the mass of the structure from the street view?  Are architectural features contributing to how the house is perceived?